

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE A-5

NEW YORK TIMES
19 January 1984

Arms-Pact Charges Against Soviet Criticized

By CHARLES MOHR

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Jan. 18—A group of former arms control negotiators and policy analysts criticized the Reagan Administration today for making public its determination that the Soviet Union had not complied with some terms of arms control agreements or obligations. They said the charges were unsubstantiated, were of no real military significance and were diplomatically unwise.

Last Friday the Administration began briefing members of Congress and journalists about what it described as five probable and two certain Soviet

breaches of its word on arms control and military matters.

A classified document detailing the charges is to be given to members of Congress in a few days, possibly on Friday, and an unclassified document is to be made public then, officials said.

The criticisms were voiced today at a news conference by Gerard C. Smith, who negotiated much of the first strategic arms limitation agreement and the Antiballistic Missile Treaty, and Paul C. Warnke, who negotiated the final version of the second strategic nuclear arms treaty. Also taking part were Herbert Scoville Jr., a former deputy director of the Central Intelligence

Agency and a former director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, John Steinbruner of the Brookings Institution and Michael Krepon of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

Different Course Suggested

They said that any indications that arms control agreements were being violated "cannot be overlooked or excused" and that the Soviet Union should be "compelled to answer" United States questions. But they said the proper procedure was to continue to seek explanations and rectification of Soviet behavior in the Standing Consultative Commission, which has periodic confidential meetings in Geneva.

The former officials contended in a written statement that President Reagan was indulging "in the politically attractive but unproductive luxury of public accusations of Soviet perfidy."

Some officials said last week that the Administration briefings last week were intended to placate conservative members of Congress who have been clamoring for public accusations and who, the White House feared, would have been upset by the President's foreign policy speech on Monday without the charges of noncompliance.

Most of the accusations made public by senior Administration officials Friday "have been around a long time," Mr. Smith said. Mr. Warnke said there was no solid evidence to prove most of them. Mr. Smith added that the alleged breaches had no substantial military significance and did not change the balance of power.

The charges included one that a large new Soviet radar station being built in central Siberia violated treaty terms limiting the size and quality of antiballistic missile defenses. The Russians say it is a radar to track objects in space, which would not be prohibited. Other charges are that a Soviet mobile missile prohibited by the second strategic arms treaty has been deployed, that encoding of electronic data during Soviet missile tests exceeds treaty limits and that the Russians are testing two new types of intercontinental ballistic missiles, rather than the single new type permitted under the terms of the second nuclear arms treaty. Although the second treaty has not been ratified, both sides have promised to live up to its major provisions providing the other side does so.